

Tyler Nissen, at the Palermo Middle School in Palermo, California, to come address their class, the class belonging to Mr. Seth Davis.

I spoke to the students about the importance of individual civic engagement in our Republic and all things in Congress.

That is when it hit me: How does the public stay in touch with what we are doing here if they can't be in the gallery or visit Washington, D.C.? It really occurs that C-SPAN is an important aspect for people to be in touch, that network whose entire purpose is to allow those watching at home to be able to do so, to be involved in what goes on in the inner workings of this town and this process in Congress.

In the grand scheme of our whole country, it is actually fairly new, having begun in 1979. Today, nearly anyone can tune in or go online, on an internet connection, and be a part of the debate, thanks to the camera coverage we have in this room as well as in our committees.

As a nonprofit, unedited, and uninterrupted channel for all things Congress, even the Presidential inauguration or State of the Union Address, C-SPAN is an integral part of our Republic. I hope more people will partake of that great tool like the students are at Palermo Middle School—and Tyler Nissen and his classmates—to be in touch with what goes on in their government.

#### WHY ARE WE TAKING CHILDREN?

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are on the eve of Father's Day. Fathers and mothers, their greatest gift, in their minds, are their children. Their greatest loves are their children. The greatest willingness to sacrifice their lives are for their children.

Mr. Rodas asked the question: "Why are you taking him?" Mr. Rodas, an immigrant from Honduras, wanted nothing more than a better life for his wife and three children, and Edison was with him.

In a policy that could be more wicked than evil, this administration, with no legal grounding, has begun to snatch children away from their fathers and their mothers.

I know the policy. It was designed some years back for unaccompanied children. It was not designed for punishment, for taking children from parents who then do not know where they are and possibly the government not being able to find them.

Why are we taking him from his father? Why are babies crying in the night? Because mothers are separated, because they have been snatched away at the border in my State, the State of Texas.

We should cease and desist, Mr. Speaker. This is Father's Day.

Why are we taking children? The American people need to know, and the American people need to stand up.

#### HONORING LISA ROMERO-MUNIZ

(Mr. KIHUEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Lisa Romero-Muniz.

Not only was Lisa the mother to her son, Anthony, but she was also known as a second mother to all the children she worked with. Lisa attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1.

Lisa was a discipline secretary at Miyamura High School in Gallup, New Mexico. The students she worked with remember her as a woman who looked out for children dealing with personal issues and for never turning her back on a kid who needed help.

Lisa would give anyone the last dime she had with no questions asked and would treat everyone like they were family.

Lisa loved purses, Jason Aldean, and Las Vegas. She was always smiling, outgoing, kind, and considerate.

Lisa is remembered as being incredibly generous and always wearing her heart on her sleeve.

I would like to extend my condolences to Lisa Romero-Muniz' family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieves with you.

#### OPIOID CRISIS AND PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is opioids week, yet we are not considering any bill that would rein in the pharmaceutical companies, whose greed caused and perpetuated the epidemic.

Many of these companies have used unethical and illegal practices to generate record-setting profits. They have bribed doctors, lied to patients about the effects of opioids, and ignored millions of illegally trafficked pills. Meanwhile, the costs of the epidemic fall on States, cities, counties, hospitals, courts, and local communities that do not have the resources to keep up.

I have introduced legislation that would make pharmaceutical companies part of the solution by imposing a small 1-cent fee on opioid production. The estimated \$2 billion in revenue raised could be used to fund a variety of prevention, treatment, and research programs that would save countless lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to finally hold these companies accountable for their role in the opioid epidemic and make them give back to the communities and families that have been destroyed.

#### CRUEL ACTIVITY AT OUR BORDERS

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today, not only as a Member of Congress but as a mother, to say that I am outraged, I am heartbroken, and I am embarrassed by the barbaric activity of our government on our borders.

The Trump administration's zero-tolerance policy is cruelly ripping children from the arms of their mothers and their fathers at our borders. They are separating them for indefinite periods of time, often in unspeakable, unbearable facilities.

We have seen a lot of ruthless actions from the Trump administration, but this is as bad as it gets. I call it government-inflicted child abuse. I stand here committed, with like-minded citizens, millions of Americans across the country, condemning these actions and committed to keeping parents and children together when they come to the United States of America.

□ 1715

#### ESTABLISHING A FEDERATION OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, this week, we saw major world leaders interfacing with the United States on topics covering the economy, diplomacy, and security engulfing the major hemispheres of the globe. Worldwide and domestic reaction suggests that no clear outcomes are perceivable. An uncertain and perhaps less secure future seems to loom.

Consequently, Americans today are faced with many questions, some formulated by ourselves and some offered by our world neighbors.

They ask: What is the role of the United States in the world?

We ask: "What right do we have to take on that role? What responsibility would we shed if we took no leadership in global affairs?"

Our allies and even our enemies may be asking: What can we expect from the United States in the future?

My own question would be this: How can the United States continue to be a force for good in the world?

To answer these questions, we need to look no further than how we govern ourselves and what we even believe is the purpose of any government.

What is the purpose of government? Simply put, it is to protect against evil, to execute justice against those committing wrong to others, to promote what benefits society, and to deter what harms it.

When the United States was established, we held some basic truths to be self-evident, namely, all of us are created equal, and we have been endowed with certain inalienable rights. Among them are the right to life, the right to live free, and the right to pursue one's happiness. We believe that governments are instituted to secure those rights, not take them away, and that the best form of government to do that would therefore be one that could only draw its power from the consent of the people, not by the people's coercion or coercing them.

Therein lies the insight that the world seeks on U.S. motivations, that the consistent role of the United States in foreign policy in the last century found our Nation in conflict with those that would use coercion, not only abusing their own people, but extending that abuse to others.

In looking to the future, no single week of diplomacy, no statements of mixed signal, no amount or shift or heft can erase the fundamental nature of how Americans view our relations with each other and other nations. It is in our DNA, whether clouded by temporary setback or assertive advance.

After World War I, when the entire system of governance of the most dominating power shifted from monarchies, nations struggled to find some form of governance for their own self-determination.

The competition between self-rule and authoritarianism saw the rise of Imperial Japan and their violation of human rights and the sovereignty of China, and that set the United States on a policy of economics, trade, and military defense that ultimately would place us in horrific conflict in the Pacific Coast.

The rise of European dictators that swept the rights of man off the map of Europe compelled us to energize our entire industrial might and willpower to ensure their complete destruction.

The realignment of governments of dominant nations into two spheres of thought after World War II meant that those that would govern themselves and enjoy the fruits of their labor and pursue happiness would come into direct conflict with those that would coerce their own people into centralized, socialist servitude in exchange for their security, for some respect, and a place on the world stage. Consequently, the United States found itself in conflict along these lines on the Korean Peninsula, in Southeast Asia, and in the Middle East.

Upon examination of our policies in the last century, many have been hypercritical, suggesting that the United States somehow used its position and power to promote its own brand of coercion rather than to be a force for good in the world. Whether one holds a bias towards one view or the other, the answer can be found with these questions:

Would the world have been better or worse economically and politically

without our intervention into the defense of South Korea in 1950?

Would the world be better off economically and politically without our collective security efforts in Europe and the formulation of NATO?

Would the world be better off without our securing of the planet's oceans for all the world to use in free trade and commerce?

Would the world be better or worse economically and politically without our policy of the right of Taiwanese defense?

Would the world be better or worse without our support to Columbia, our intervention in Kuwait and the Balkans as we closed the last century?

These are questions to ponder, but as we examine what our economic and political map of the last century might look like if all of these nations were tipped in favor of coercive governments vice those of self-determination, one thing is clear: the actors promoting coercion rather than liberty appear much the same as we enter a new era.

Our lines of conflict today are much as they have always been with nations that lack democratic rule, that show disregard for the rule of law, that fail to respect basic human rights, that violate intellectual and private property, that manipulate their economies, that restrict commerce, and that close their doors to cultural and educational exchange.

So we find ourselves with old enemies in a new era, not always defined by particular nations, as governments shift and what were once bitter enemies 50 or 100 years ago are now vital partners and friends with us. But the old enemies will always be those against life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

While our enemies ideologically may be consistent, we would not always know it when examining our foreign policy and economic efforts in this century. For much of this century, under bipartisan administrations, we have experimented with the notion that we can somehow embrace those with a diametrically opposed form of governance and view of liberty and that our goodwill will somehow be reciprocated with their conversion to good behavior.

So far, that path has led us to political and economic imbalance with lasting consequence. Worse, it may be placing us on a path of monumental conflict as enemies of liberty and self-determination use newfound resources to coerce global spheres beyond what the world ultimately will be willing to bear.

The path to that conflict, though, is not inevitable, but it will take a strategic vision that is severely lacking in our Nation today. Rather than focus on sovereign states or regions of the globe to maintain our security, we need to embrace the idea of curbing enemies of liberty and their ability to extend their reach wherever they may be found.

The task is not impossible. In fact, the ingredients of it are all around us,

already identified by our practices rather than by our politics. What is needed is to articulate a long-range strategic vision, something rare in Washington, to promote life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And here it is. Here is the vision: The answer lies in the collective efforts of the nations who have democratic, free, stable governance.

What if the vast bulk of our trade were exclusively with those nations? What if the economic systems, to our mutual benefit, were intertwined exclusively with those nations? What if our information and innovation sharing were only with those countries? What if our militaries partnered in mutual security with these countries?

Now, I know what you are thinking: Don't we already have some of this? Ingredients, yes; a baked cake, no. We find ourselves still embracing those that would use their power to coerce rather than to promote, to thief, to steal, to manipulate, and use our openness to advance their power, and we worry that our individual effort may not be enough to contain the dangers that lie ahead economically, diplomatically, or, worse, even militarily.

And yet, if our discourse with other nations were to place the bad actors on the outside rather than on the inside, there is no collective effort that they could muster to withstand our combination.

If we were to form a federation of freedom among the no-kidding democratic nations of the world, we could simply do what our own individual governments do, but on a mutually benefitting scale: protect against evil, uphold justice against those committing wrong to others, promote what benefits society, and deter what harms it. Those standing against these principles would find themselves on the outside of trade, on the outside of diplomacy, on the outside of military security, and they would be unable to leverage our freedoms and use them against us.

Ask yourself these questions:

Is a superior economy better in the hands of those that would protect intellectual and physical property or with those who do not?

Are diplomatic alliances better made with those that respect the rule of law and national sovereignty or with those who do not?

Is the sharing of information better exchanged with those who use knowledge to promote good, empower, and entrust their own citizens with the free-flowing press or with those who use it to take away those things?

Is superior military might better in the hands of those that promote the value of life and individual liberty, or is it better in the hands of those who do not?

Is the existence of a collective superior strength better in the hands of partners using their force for good or in the hands of those who will use it to usurp, suppress, and oppress?

The ingredients of a federation for freedom are all around us. Like it or

not, the United States may be the only nation with the resources to lead such an effort as it accidentally found itself in the last century.

For those rejecting such a notion that America must lead, I am reminded of Obadiah 11, where it says: "On the day you stood aloof . . . you became as one of them."

We can no more abrogate our mantle of leadership of the free world than the free world can wish for a global construct absent American security and economy. What remains is to ditch the notion that the United States is somehow a force for bad in the world and that we need to recede our position.

We must ditch the notion that the United States violates human rights rather than is foremost in securing human rights globally, and we must abandon the premise that we have no right to lead on the ideals with which we have governed ourselves since 1789. We know no other path. It is in our DNA.

If the United States were to lead and form a federation of freedom, we would have the commercial development to create competitive markets and unite in mutually beneficial innovative advancements. We would have the diplomatic strength to unite on human rights. We would have the ability to promote underdeveloped nations with the skills and structure necessary through our cultural exchanges and our institutions of higher learning, while exchanging the same through our partners.

We would have the collective strength to protect shipping lanes and ward off those wishing to usurp free trade or pirate the commerce as it passes by, and we would have the collective strength to withstand the most active of coercive actors. We would be a beacon for those wishing to find their way into such a federation rather than falling subject to coercive friends and neighbors wishing to enslave others into an authoritarian future.

□ 1730

What of the federation? What would these nations look like. How about this: 7 of the G7; 16 of the G20, and 75 nations, whose democratic index places them high enough on the list to maintain a government ruled by their own people as they secure their liberty.

A federation of freedom nations would have this in common: free elections, respect for the rule of law, basic human rights, stable economics, a free economy united in free trade among federation members, protections for intellectual and private property, and open arms for cultural and educational exchange. The good news is much of this exists, it is just not organized and it is not led.

To our authoritarian competitors, or worse, the pariah states of the globe, here is a simple truth: History has shown that our historical enemies do not have to be our future enemies. However, one thing is certain: Our fu-

ture enemies will continue to be those that are opposite of the ideals that formed our American mindset for freedom and liberty, whether we want to recognize that as the American people or not.

So to the American people, I urge you to call on this Congress to support such a federation.

To the President, I say, Mr. President, this could not only be your moment, but it could be what the freedom-loving people of the world hope you would be in a leader. Organize and lead such a federation.

The concept is simple; its execution most difficult. Its reward: prosperity and security on a grand scale.

And let the world be assured, despite mixed signals, spurtive advancements or setbacks, the habits of the American people still offer hope because of how we govern ourselves. To our enemies, that hope should also offer warning.

Let us, therefore, embark with such democratic like-minded nations to secure such a federation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### TEARING IMMIGRANT CHILDREN AWAY FROM THEIR PARENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject matter of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address this body on a very important issue that we need to bring to the attention of the people of this country.

I am proud to have so many of my colleagues here today to stand up against the President's policy of systematically tearing immigrant children away from their families. These innocent children are being held under inhumane conditions at detention facilities, alone and apart from their parents.

President Trump's chief of staff, General Kelly, recently, when asked about this, said:

The children will be taken care of, put into foster care, or whatever.

This is an unacceptable answer.

The administration is tearing children away from their parents, including infants and toddlers, and in some cases, holding these children in cages.

The United Nations has noted that children arriving at the U.S. border who plead for asylum with their par-

ents is a legal form of entry, and separating children away from their parents is illegal and a violation of human rights.

These immoral practices are being executed by the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security, to instill fear and deter families, who are already fleeing extreme fear and violence in their native homes. They are trying to, again, deter them from seeking legal protection in America.

For example, from October 2017 to April 2018, 700 children were separated. But in just the first 13 days of May of this year, 2018, 658 children were separated, which almost equals the previous 6 months. Children are literally being ripped from their mothers' arms, who are simply seeking safety for their families. And immorally, the administration is breaking up families, plain and simple. Asylum seekers should not be held hostage and penalized for wanting to be protected from harm.

This new policy is clearly unprecedented, cruel, and altogether dead wrong. It is imperative that we stand up against the administration's un-American policies towards families.

Today, my colleagues and I are standing up against this barbaric action and demand the administration stop punishing children and stop punishing families who are fearing for their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), my good friend and distinguished colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CORREA for yielding, and I thank him for organizing this Special Order.

It is a part of immigration law—it is not a violation of immigration law, it is a part of immigration law—that people fleeing for their lives can come to the United States and apply for asylum. Not only is that in our statutes, but it is also in a treaty that we ratified. People concerned about the rule of law ought to realize this is part of our law.

Here is what is happening. People fleeing for their lives, primarily from Central America, are going to the ports of entry. In some cases, we have received reports that they make their claim and their children are taken away from them, I believe in violation of law.

In other cases, even though they are there to make an application, they are turned away by Border Patrol. They then go down the road and find a Border Patrol agent to turn themselves in to, to make their claim for political asylum. And when that happens, their children are then taken away from them.

Mr. Speaker, there is a report today from the Department of Health and Human Services, which says that since this policy was adopted by the Trump administration, 1,329 kids have been taken from their parents in this cruel policy. I think that this is not the American way.